DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 435 CS 504 241

AUTHOR Krug, Linda T.
TITLE Sizing Up the Situation: Kenneth Burke's Dramatistic Frames.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association (Lincoln, NE, April 7-9, 1983).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Editorials; *Literary Genres; *Political Issues; *Press Opinion; *Rhetoric; Rhetorical Criticism; *Self Concept; Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Burke (Kenneth); Dramatistic Criticism; *Nixon (Richard M); Watergate

ABSTRACT

Testing Kenneth Burke's theory on dramatistic frames, the attitudes and motivations reflected in the rhetoric of Watergate participants were analyzed in terms of literary forms: epic, tragic, comic, elegiac, satiric, burlesque, grotesque, and didactic. Nixon tried to transcend the Watergate conflict by stressing the greatness of his achievements and the nobility of his character in relation to inevitable human limitations (epic) and overwhelming circumstances (tragic). Stressing Nixon's human side, pro-Nixon editorials presented a comic framework, while anti-Nixon editorials, pointing out the contradiction between this supposed identification with all people and the claimed inviability of the Presidency, lent themselves to satire, burlesque, and didacticism. Although these last three rejection frames were most common during the Watergate era--both heightening and easing public sentiment, the occasional articles now written about Watergate generally fall into the acceptance mode--epic, comic, or tragic representations which emphasize the commonality of human experience and encourage perspective taking. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED234435

SIZING UP THE SITUATION:
KENNETH BURKE'S DRAMATISTIC FRAMES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Linda T. Krug
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0329
402/472-3348

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Linda T. Krug
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper Presented to the
Rhetorical Theory Division of
Central States Speech Association
Lincoln, Nebraska 1983

CS 504241

SIZING UP THE SITUATION:
KENNETH BURKE'S DRAMATISTIC FRAMES

Everyday we encounter a variety of situations and experiences with which we must come to terms. Events like a Reagan press conference, a "fender-bender" in a parking lot, a falling-out with a collegue all prompt a sizing-up of the situation, a naming of its important ingredients, and a choosing of an appropriate response.[1] The posture we take toward those events--and the linguistic choice(s) we ultimately make--is formed by the particular world view each of us holds. "One's Weltanschauung," Jamieson reveals, "intimately tied to one's epistemology, psychology, axiology and metaphysics, colors rhetorical choice."[2] In other words, where we sit and how we stand influence what we see and how we see it.

Kenneth Burke suggests we can best understand those stances and the ways in which they inform our choices by couching them in terms of the great literary forms, the epic, tragic, comic, elegiac, satiric, burlesque, grotesque, and didactic dramatistic frames. Such a move allows us to talk about Weltanschauung and strategies for encountering experiences not only as if they were drama, but as if they were a particular kind of drama, and consequently, to focus more clearly on human motivation and behavior. My purpose in this paper is to explore such a supposition by examining the unfolding characteristics and informing nature of the dramatistic frames within the complex of Watergate events.

Prelude to Symbolic Action

A proper placement of the dramatic frames begins with an understanding of "the most basic of attitudes: Yes, No, and the intermediate realm of Maybe."[3] These attitudes take their form as Acceptance, Rejection, and Passivity. Acceptance, Burke notes, is the "more or less organized system of meanings by which a thinking man <woman> gauges the historical situation and adopts a role with relation to it."[4] More specifically, an acceptance frame demarcates those authority symbols of which we approve. If, for instance, we were engaged in conversation and heard a remark like "Democracy is the cornerstone of American life and liberty" or "All people are inherently good," we would know we were in the company of an acceptance frame.

Conversely, were we to hear such phrases as "Democracy is a fallacy" or "People are, by nature, evil," we could assume those thoughts generated from a rejection frame; for rejection, Burke states, unlike acceptance, stresses a shift in allegiance from the symbols of authority. As a negative-oriented frame rejection offers no alternative symbol(s) of authority to replace the one(s) it casts aside. Rejection "rejects" absolutely.[5]

Existing somewhere between acceptance and rejection is the attitude of passivity. A passive frame rejects one set of authority symbols while replacing it with another. For instance, if someone noted "Socialism is the only system that can rid us of capitalistic destruction" or "It's time the United States moves away from an interventionist strategy and toward an isolationist stance," we would detect an underlying thrust of passivity. Those

who choose one acceptance frame over another, Burke suggests, "whose <own> frame would persuade him <her> to draw the line of battle differently," would be considered as adhering to a passive frame.[6]

As the fundamental attitudes around which our Weltanschauung pivot, acceptance, rejection, and passivity shape our relations with other humans; they not only prepare us for and against some functions and for and against persons representing those functions, but also tell us how we should be for and against (Burke's emphasis). "Call a man a villain," Burke states, "and you have the choice of either attacking or cringing. Call him mistaken, and you invite yourself to attempt setting him right."[7] These thoughts take on added meaning when we recall Burke's admonishment that action requires programs and, subsequently, programs require vocabularies. To act wisely, we must use words which, by their very nature, name friendly or unfriendly functions and relationships in such a way that we are able to encounter and act upon them.[8] Cast in this light, each frame lends itself to particular actions in concert with a particular way of drawing the lines.

The universal frames of acceptance, rejection, and passivity form the backdrop against which the dramatic frames unfold; each dramatic frame has as its motivating force either acceptance, rejection, or passivity. Anchored in the acceptance frame, the epic, tragic, and comic frames positively accept reigning symbols of authority. Lodged in rejection, the elegiac, satiric, and burlesque frames promote a shift in those symbols. The grotesque

and didactic represent special cases of passivity, with the former shrouded in mystery and the latter in propaganda.[9]

Dramatic Frames as Symbolic Action

Drawing from Burke's notes on the universal frames, it appears that as each universal frame draws the lines of battle and cooperation differently, so each of the dramatic frames do likewise. "Each of the great forms," Burke states, "stresses its own peculiar way of building the mental equipment (meanings, attitudes, character) by which one handles the significant factors of <his/her> times."[10] It seems reasonable, then, to consider each frame as a particular drama, as encompassing, in microcosmic version, certain vocabularies for the charting of human motives.[11]

For the purposes of this essay, I have chosen to demonstrate the dramatic frames in terms of the varied rhetoric surrounding the Watergate events. An analysis of the Watergate era seems a suitable illustration for two reasons. First, Watergate has the advantage of being a "complete" drama.[12] As a complete drama, Watergate lends itself to a fuller analysis of the ways in which the dramatic frames play themselves out. Second, because Watergate generated such a corpus of rhetoric, it is likely that several of the frames will be operative at once. Cast in this light, the Watergate era provides an opportunity to capture both some theoretical breadth and depth within the dramatistic frames. With this bit of a justification in mind, I turn now to an explication of the epic, tragic, comic, satiric, burlesque, and didactic dramatic frames.[13]

Epic. Situated in a dialectical struggle between human capacity and limitations, the epic frame portrays "everyperson" in his/her search for recognition and greatness in the eyes of others.[14] As an acceptance frame, the epic elevates human capacity over human limitations in a scenario featuring the act-purpose pentadic ratio. The actions of the individual struggling to overcome his/her limitations form the boundaries of the epic action and in doing so reflect the purpose behind those actions.

Against an all-inclusive background, the epic hero embarks upon a life-long quest to instill his/her name with meaning. Since this meaning can be attained only if s/he is able to maintain control over the environment and/or others, the hero is impelled to act. Thus, s/he is plunged into a contest of excellence, fighting monsters, men, and natural obstacles to demonstrate control and impose being on the world. Struggle as s/he may, though, when the dust finally settles implictly or explictly, the hero's inescapable limitations await; s/he recognizes that greatness is tempered by abilities.[15]

Within the framework of Watergate, the epic frame guides many of Nixon's addresses and pro-Nixon editorials. Each epic piece pits human capabilities against human shortcomings and, in doing so, elucidates Nixon's accomplishments. For instance, in his resignation speech, Nixon offers:

> Sometimes I have succeeded. And sometimes I have failed. But always I have taken heart from what Theodore Roosevelt said about the man in the arena whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood, who strives valiantly, who errs and comes short again and again because there is no effort without error and shortcoming.[16]

Certainly in his eyes and, he hopes, in the eyes of the American people, Nixon becomes the gallant hero. Having striven throughout his tenure as President in a quest for valiant goals, Nixon must now resign himself to the humility of knowing he cannot succeed. Still, Nixon emerges victorious. Though he comes up short, his every act stands as a symbolic memento of the worthiness of the pursuit.

Also emerging as an epic frame and highlighting Nixon's thoughts is an editorial in the Milwaukee Journal (9 Aug. 1974): "So it was that Richard Nixon, the extraordinary scrambler who yearned for lasting glory, sealed his doom in layers of falsehood."[17] Again, the image of the man shortchanged by his own limitations in the search for glory emerges.

Tragedy. Like the epic, the tragic frame deals with humans and their relationships to the universe and exploits the notion of resignation in light of human limitations. The tragic frame differs, though, in its emphasis. Whereas the epic elevates the nobility of the act, the tragic elevates the nobility of the agent, giving way to a scenario stressing the agent-scene ratio.[18]

The tragic drama unfolds bit by bit with the actions of the tragic hero. As those events take shape, we see the hero/heroine engaged in a variety of activities which will ultimately lead to his/her demise. Although virtuous, strong, and courageous, s/he is unable to overcome the circumstances--a complex of time, persons, places, and things--operating in the background of his/her actions. Reflected in the agent is the complex of circumstances leading to destruction.

Of the mass of Watergate rhetoric, only one set exemplifies the tragic frame--Nixon's addresses. In his acceptance of Ford's September 9, 1974 pardon, for example, Nixon humbly admits:

> Looking back on what is still in my mind a complex and confusing maze of events, decisions, pressures, and personalities, one thing I can see clearly now is that I was wrong in not acting more decisively. . . . That I tried to deal with Watergate the wrong way is a burden I shall bear for everyday of the life that is left to me.[19]

The essence of the tragic frame is vividly captured in this segment. Nixon's actions take shape within a scene comprised of delimiting people, places, and events. From this interplay between act and scene, Nixon realizes his limitations and resigns himself to his fate.

Comedy. Rounding out the variations in the acceptance frame is the comic. The key to this frame can be found in Burke's admonishment that human enlightenment reaches its peak when people are viewed not as vicious but as mistaken. Adding the notion that people are necessarily mistaken, "that all people are exposed to situations in which they must act as fools," the comic frame is completed, returning again to the "lesson of humility." Here, the act and the agent merge to become one.[20]

The dialectical struggle in the comic frame arises out of discrepancies between "what is" and "what ought to be." The comic depicts "what is" as a stable, harmonious order disrupted by folly, obsession, forgetfulness, pride, prejudice, or events not understood by the characters themselves, and "what ought to be" as the restoring of the order. In scenario after scenario, the agent

unwittingly engages in acts in which his/her character flaws rise to the fore. In the end, the agent realizes that s/he shares these flaws with all; as this act of recognition is consumated, the social order is rendered stable and harmonious.[21]

The majority of pro-Nixon supporters (up until Nixon's resignation from office) and bipartisan journalists (commencing after the resignation) operate within the framework of comedy. Their rhetoric emphasizes that Nixon, like everyone else, is not perfect. The Chicago Today American, explains that "essentially they <the tapes> show . . . that our government leaders really are no more than life size; that they can make dumb decisions just like the rest of us and for the same reasons."[22] The Dallas Morning News also refers to Nixon and others involved in the Watergate scandal as mistaken. "It was a crime of course . . . but if higher-ups in the reelection campaign are revealed as having been involved . . . the public finding against them should be one of stupidity."[23] Again, the acts of the "higher-ups" merge with the agent(s) to reflect the mistaken quality involved.

Satire. In the manner of comedy, satire engages in illuminating the differences between "what is" and "what ought to be." Almost every instance involves the characters in a subterfuge, in a contradiction between appearance and what the audience knows to be reality.[24] Where comedy exalts, however, satire deflates. As a rejection frame, satire does not adequately size up the situation. There are no happy endings in the satiric frame; in the dismal picture painted of the world there is no such thing as resolution.

People are vicious and villainous, never reconcilable. Here the act-attitude ratio dominates the scenario.[25]

The agent (representative everyperson) seeks his/her own end, one which is seldom noble. It is a fight in a dog-eat-dog world, littered with others who are potential enemies, who are in some way, out to cheat and swindle. In essence, the frame revolves around the philosophy of getting all you can before someone beats you to it. Thus, the agent's attitude precludes acts of debauchery and deception of others and, conversely, acts of debauchery and deception are reflected in the agent's attitude.

Not surprisingly, the satiric frame emerges most predominantly from the pens of anti-Nixon journalists. One editorial in the Washington Post, for instance, exclaims:

> The "rest of us"? But surely this is Mr. Nixon's administration, and surely it was in his name and in his behalf that men who were his appointees and closest confidents committed the crimes and excesses that the President now deplores.[26]

The act-attitude ratio is clearly operative. It depicts the differences between what is and what ought to be, focusing on the "what is" and the attitude revolving around it. This example, like others, serves to undermine Nixon, to get to the heart of his actions, to carefully lay open his own attitude toward the event.

Burlesque. A subspecies of satire, burlesque, aims at exposing people's greed or hubris. Being both tolerant and jovial, burlesque minimizes concern with condemning humans while exploiting our flaws. It takes "what is" and reduces it to

absurdity.[27] A sense of merger between the act performed and the agency by which it is performed characterizes burlesque.

A burlesque scenario unfolds in brief vignettes depicting an agent involved in a variety of deeds performed in a ridiculous manner, e.g., if an act is usually executed slowly, the agent performs it quickly; if a dancer is to waltz gracefully, s/he stumbles and falls. Manners become mannerisms. In this sense, burlesque is only a partial frame. It is useful only to the extent that we can provide the ways of making allowances for it.

Of the many and varied editorials examined, only one speaks with a burlesque voice. Discussing "The Gap," the 18 1/2 minute tape erasure, the Richmond News Leader states, "So last week two prosecutors--one mini-skirted, the other fashionably mutton-chopped--made mincemeat of Mary Woods, super-contortionist, accidentially erasing (sic) 18.5 minutes of a critical Oval Office tape."[28] The image pressed upon our minds with this account is one of absurdity: not only has this report focused on the questionable body positions of Nixon's secretary, but on the behavior of the prosecuting attorneys as well. Both the good guys and the bad guys are indicted by this attitude.

Didacticism. Finally, the didactic frame shares remnants of both acceptance and rejection. What it takes with the left hand, it gives back with the right. It is properly known as the drama of attack, implying that it is primarily a rejection frame. Yet, it plays upon this rejection, twisting and tugging until, at the end, it seems to be an acceptance frame. This dialectical nature places didacticism within the passive realm. Stressing the

agency-purpose ratio, didacticism juxtaposes human action against the operations of social systems, and "depicts, exhorts, accuses, and censures."[29]

In the didactic frame the focus is on subsystems of the sociopolitical system, e.g., financial or political systems, which seem to be responsible for violent social disorder. In the didactic we see a particular institution using a variety of means to exploit the "common folk." Deception and lies are elevated as the means by which to attain any end. Throughout the scenario, the people attempt to come to an understanding of the variety of agencies used to dupe and of the means by which to rectify the situation.

Both anti- and pro-Nixon journalistics spin out of a didactic frame. Representative of an anti-Nixon view is an editorial in the Knickerbocker News:

> As has been the case so many times, when its bluff is called, the Nixon White House retreats into sulky silence. It's evidently easier for this President to wave the flag than to adhere to the principles for which that noble banner stands."[30]

Here the Nixon White House is featured as an agency through which justice is supposed to be propagated. The article questions and rejects the intentions precipitating the ways in which that justice is now being carried out, hinting at the way things ought to proceed. Opting to embrace the principles of democracy ("for which that noble banner stands"), the Knickerbocker News clearly rejects the Nixon White House.

Renaming the agency and the purpose from a pro-Nixon perspective, the Arizona Republic also depicts a didactic scenario: "What more, one might ask, can the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives want? The answer is clear: they want Richard M. Nixon's head on a silver platter."[31] The agency responsible for finding truth, the Judiciary Committee, is revealed as misusing its inherent powers to secure an unworthy goal. Rather than upholding the truth (as an acceptable motivating force), the Judiciary makes a mockery of it. The Arizona Republic, in no uncertain terms, rejects the culprits for the more noble venture of the pursuit of truth.

Theoretical Implications

The above explanation and illustrations demonstrate the workings of the dramatic frames as strategies for sizing up situations. From this description and analysis, several statements can be drawn about both the Watergate era and the nature and power of the dramatistic frames as interpretative devices as well.

Thoughout the Watergate era, Nixon attempted to transcend the Watergate conflict by emphasizing one of two episodes. One illuminated his great achievements against the reasons precipitating his actions (epic), and the other pitted his noble character against a comprehensive scene (tragic). Blending the epic with the tragic allowed Nixon to err, fixing his character and deeds within the very act of erring.

Pro-Nixon editorials view him in a similar light and necessarily stress him in a positive sense. In addition to considering Nixon as a tragic and epic figure, pro-Nixon editorials also ground his character in the supposition that he, like everyone, is mistaken. Nixon's human side and proclaimed identification with all people become the essence of this rhetoric. This very essence, however, lends itself to satire, burlesque, and didacticism.

Nixon traps himself in a contradiction when using the acceptance frames. He claims to be just like everyone else, but at the same time, reaffirms his position as remaining above all. Seizing upon this opportunity, anti-Nixon editorials reject Nixon by revealing the way things really are; they lay open the contradition. Satire and burlesque allow condemnation of Nixon on the basis of his flaws without having to emphasize his great deeds as well. Didacticism broadens this base, enabling one to make statements about the man representing a sociopolitical institution. Frames that primarily reject, however, undermind not only their intended subjects of attack, but also the nature of the world as a whole: they destroy without helping to rebuild. Yet, they are powerful frames, able to reduce the most serious of situations to nothing. Given the magnitude of issues emerging from the Watergate scandal--the separation of powers, the Mafia-like actions on the part of high officials, and the deliberate evasion and deception--satire, burlesque, and didacticism functioned to both heighten, and ease, public sentiment.

It is interesting to note that the sporadic flurry of articles now written about Watergate fall into an acceptance mode. Though satiric, burlesque, and didactic editorials still appear, they no longer command the same kind attention. The reason for such a phenomenon lies in the power of the acceptance frames. The epic, tragic, and most particularly the comic frame forge identification through a "we are all humans who make mistakes" line of reasoning. Acceptance frames have the ability to transcend social hierarchies while reveling in the commonality of the human experience. In doing so, they allow for some perspective taking; they invite us to sit back and take stock of what we are experiencing in the here-and-now, what we have experienced in the past, and what we might experience in the future, and they force us to consider individual concerns in light of sociopolitical concerns. In times of discontent, then, the acceptance frames cradle stability, security, and tranquility.

The rejection frames do not have the ability to promote stability. Flourishing primarily and most whole-heartedly in times of social anomy, rejection frames can only point to what is wrong and what must be changed; they can only tear down, not build up. Thus, at the very outset, rejection frames can be unsettling to a people desperately trying to believe in the righteousness of their values and beliefs; there is no security in knowing those societal values we harbor deep inside might be in jeopardy or that those leaders in which we have placed our faith might be playing havoc with our rights and beliefs. Rejection frames, then, serve to heighten awareness and prepare us for change, but in and of themselves they cannot actually accomplish that change.

The passive frame of didacticism may be the intermediate process whereby we shift from a rejection to an acceptance frame. Didacticism can incorporate all that satire and burlesque reject with all that epic, tragedy, and comedy accept. Still, we cannot straddle the proverbial fence forever. Faced with a choice between rejection and acceptance, we most often choose the route of acceptance. Rejection, Burke notes, leads to Guilt--and this Guilt, if we are to live our lives, must be expiated.[32] Only by embracing an accepting attitude can that task be accomplished.

Theoretically then, the dramatistic frames provide clues for understanding how people size up and encounter their experiences. They provide insight into the dynamics underlying rhetorical events, the various motives operating in the encountering of the experience, and the manner in which various vocabularies play off of one another. Further examination of the frames can only result in major contributions to Burkeian theory and criticism.

End Notes

[1] Kenneth Burke, Philosophy of Literary Form (Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1973; rpt. 1941, 1967), pp. 1, 303-04.

[2] Kathleen Jamieson, "The Rhetorical Manifestations of Weltanschauung," CSSJ, 28 (Spring 1976), 4.

[3] Kenneth Burke. Attitudes Toward History (Los Altos, Calif.: Hermes Publications, 1959), p. xxi.

[4] Burke, Attitudes, pp. 5, 19-20.

[5] Burke, Attitudes, pp. 21-22.

[6] Burke, Attitudes, pp. 20-21.

[7] Burke, Attitudes, p. 4.

[8] Burke, Attitudes, p. 4.

[9] Burke, Attitudes, pp. 34-80.

[10] Burke, Attitudes, p. 34.

[11] Burke states that two of the pentadic elements (Scene, Agent, Agency, Purpose, Act) may be featured in a particular drama in such a way that "implicit in the quality of <one> is the quality of the other." Use of the pentadic ratios permits making a more well-rounded statement about the motives of each dramatic frame. See Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives (Berkeley: Univ. of Calif. Press, 1945; rpt. 1969), pp. 15-20.

[12] One may argue that Watergate has never ended, a view to which I am, in one sense, partial. However, I speak of Watergate as complete in that after Ford's pardon of Nixon, and the few months of discontent following that action, a sense of finality settled over the event.

[13] My analysis deals with only six of the eight dramatic frames. Elegy and grotesque are excluded because neither is operative in the Watergate rhetoric. Perhaps these frames are embedded in untapped Watergate rhetoric, such as statements by the Watergate Investigation Committee and the House Judiciary Committee, or, it may be that an event like Watergate does not lend itself to grotesque and elegiac modes. Examination of events which spin out of grotesque and/or elegiac modes would be a fruitful endeavor.

[14] For a literary examination of the epic purpose, see Paul Merchant, The Epic (London: Methuen, 1971); and Thomas Greene, The Descent from Heaven: A Study in Epic Continuity (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1963).

[15] Greene, The Descent from Heaven, p. 14.

[16] Richard Nixon, "Let He Who Is Without Sin Cast the First Stone," Presidential resignation delivered from the White House, Washington, D.C., 8 Aug. 1974. Reprinted in Vital Speeches of the Day (15 Aug. 1974), pp. 643-44. Other epic addresses include Nixon's 30 April 1973 address on the Watergate Affair, reprinted in Facts on File (Sunday 29 April-Saturday 5 May 1973), p. 350; the 22 May address on the Watergate Affairs, reprinted in Facts on File (Sunday 20 May-Sunday 26 May 1973), p. 423.

[17] For other examples of pro-Nixon epic rhetoric see Orlando <Florida> Sentinel, 8 March 1974; St. Louis Globe-Democrat, 1 May 1974; Argus-Leader <Sioux Falls>, 2 May 1974; Washington Post, 9 Aug. 1974; and the Virginian-Pilot <Norfolk>, 10 Aug. 1974.

[18] For further inquiry, see Norman Berlin, The Secret Cause: A Discussion of Tragedy (Amherst: Univ. of Mass. Press, 1981);

Geoffrey Brereton, Principles of Tragedy (Coral Gables, Fla.: Univ. of Miami Press, 1968); and Raymond Williams, Modern Tragedy (Standford, Calif.: Standford Univ. Press, 1966; rpt. 1967).

[19] Richard Nixon, "Acceptance of Pardon" delivered 8 Sept. 1974. Reprinted in Facts on File (14 Sept. 1974), p. 745.

[20] Burke, Grammar of Motives, p. 41. This notion is also reflected in Robert Corrigan's, Comedy: Meaning and Form (New York: Harper and Row, 1981), p. 11. Corrigan states that the spirit of comedy celebrates our capacity not only to endure our tragic fate, but to overcome it with a kind of energy and exuberance, insisting that our good fortune is every bit as much an active force in our lives as our limitations. Our fate may be tragic, but comedy, in all its forms, is an assertion of that life force which enables us to be joyous survivors in an acceptable and accepting world.

[21] Corrigan, Comedy, pp. 210.

[22] Chicago Today American, Chicago, IL, 1 May 1974. Other comic examples can be seen in the Arkansas Democrat <Little Rock>, 26 July 1973 and the Winnipeg Free Press, 24 April 1973.

[23] Dallas Morning News, 19 April 1973.

[24] For a literature-based report of the satiric mode, see Alvin B. Kernan, The Plot of Satire (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1965); Ashley Brown and John L. Kimmey, Satire (New York: Harper, 1977); Leonard Feinberg, Introduction to Satire (Ames: Iowa State Univ. Press, 1967), and Author Pollard, Satire (London: Methuen, 1970).

[25] "Attitude" is not an official pentadic element. However, Burke does state in that at times the attitude will be emphasized

over another term. Satire seems to be one of those cases Burke refers to.

[26] Washington Post, 17 Feb. 1974. Additionally, the States Item <New Orleans>, 19 April 1973, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 19 April 1973, the Newsday <Long Island>, 24 July 1973, Washington Post, 16 Jan. 1974, the Blade <Toledo>, 17 Jan. 1974, and the Arkansas Gazette <Little Rock>, 8 June 1974 provide insight into the satiric frame.

[27] For sources which depict the burlesque in its literary grounding, see John D. Jump, Burlesque (London: Methuen, 1972); and Archibald Bolling Shepperson, The Novel in Motley: A History of the Burlesque Novel in England (New York: Octagon, 1967).

[28] The Richmond News Leader, 21 Jan. 1974.

[29] Sam Smiley, The Drama of Attack: Didactic Plays of the American Depression (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1972), p. 63.

[30] Knickerbocker News <Albany>, 12 April 1974. See also the New York Post, 17 Jan. 1974; the Detroit News, 17 Jan. 1974; the Daily Oklahoman <Oklahoma City>, 13 April 1974; Newsday <Long Island>, 2 May 1974; and the New York Times, 19 July 1974 for examples of didactic rhetoric which emphasizes rejection.

[31] The Arizona Republic <Phoenix>, 1 May 1974. Also see The Birmingham News, 1 May 1974 for an example of didactic rhetoric emphasizing acceptance.

[32] See Hugh Duncan, Communication & Social Order (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970; rpt. 1962), pp. 125ff.